

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ROBERT PANTON,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:06-CV-0809
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
B.O.P. et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 26th day of April, 2007, upon consideration of plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 49) pursuant to FED. R. Civ. P. 59(e), in which he seeks reconsideration of this court's order (Doc. 47) denying his motion to amend his amended complaint (Doc. 27), and it appearing that a proper Rule 59(e) motion "must rely on one of three major grounds: '(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence [not available previously]; [or], (3) the need to correct clear error [of law] or prevent manifest injustice,'" North River Ins. Co. v. Cigna Reinsurance Co., 52 F.2d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)(citations omitted); see also Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906 (3d Cir. 1985), and it appearing that plaintiff fails to demonstrate that the court made a manifest error of law, that new evidence has become available, or that any new law has arisen, and it further appearing that plaintiff simply disagrees with the ruling of the court, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 49) is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge